



General Assembly

Sixtieth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
14 June 2006

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 50th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 28 April 2006, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Ashe (Antigua and Barbuda)
*Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative
 and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Saha*

Contents

Agenda item 46: Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields (*continued*)

Agenda item 118: United Nations reform: measures and proposals (*continued*)

Agenda item 120: Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit (*continued*)

Agenda item 122: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 124: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (*continued*)

Agenda item 128: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 129: Human resources management (*continued*)

Agenda item 136: Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations (*continued*)

Agenda item 124: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (*continued*)

Estimates in respect of special political missions, good offices and other political initiatives authorized by the General Assembly and/or the Security Council (continued)

Agenda item 122: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Completion of the work of the Fifth Committee at the first part of the resumed sixtieth session of the General Assembly

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.



The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.

Agenda item 46: Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields *(continued)*

Agenda item 118: United Nations reform: measures and proposals *(continued)*

Agenda item 120: Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit *(continued)*

Agenda item 122: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations *(continued)*

Agenda item 124: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 *(continued)*

Agenda item 128: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations *(continued)*

Agenda item 129: Human resources management *(continued)*

Agenda item 136: Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations *(continued)*

Draft resolution A/C.5/60/L.37/Rev.1

1. **The Chairman** drew attention to draft resolution A/C.5/60/L.37/Rev.1, entitled "Investing in the United Nations: for a stronger Organization worldwide", which had been submitted and orally revised by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

2. **Mr. Kumalo** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, at the request of certain members of the Group, he had met with the Permanent Representative of Austria, the current European Union President, to compare the two groups' positions on the draft resolution with a view to finding common ground. He requested that the meeting be suspended to enable him to brief the members of his Group on the meeting.

3. **Mr. Pfanzelter** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union, confirmed that a meeting had taken place earlier in the day at the request of members of both groups and at the urging of the Secretary-General. He underscored that the purpose of the meeting had been to achieve a consensus on the outstanding issues; no course of action had been agreed at the meeting, since both delegations had first to consult with the members of their respective groups.

The meeting was suspended at 3.55 p.m. and resumed at 6.45 p.m.

4. **Mr. Kumalo** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/60/L.37/Rev.1 wished it to be adopted without a vote and in conformity with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. They were therefore willing to withdraw the revision to section VIII of the draft resolution proposed at the Committee's 49th meeting. He regretted that it had not been possible to bridge the gap between delegations despite his own efforts and those of his Austrian counterpart, noting that a compromise solution that would have been acceptable to the Group of 77 and China had been offered only to be taken off the table subsequently. He urged the Committee to adopt the draft resolution with the revisions proposed orally at the Committee's 48th meeting.

5. **The Chairman** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the draft resolution. In that connection, he drew attention to rule 128 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

6. **Mr. Kumalo** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that it would be helpful to know which delegations had made the request.

7. **Mr. Abelian** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the vote had been requested by the delegations of Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

8. **Mr. Pfanzelter** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote before the voting, said that management reform was central to achieving a stronger and more effective United Nations. He therefore welcomed the Secretary-General's report (A/60/692 and Corr.1), which would serve as a good basis for such reform and was particularly valuable because it presented Member States with the Secretary-General's own vision of the situation at hand. He also endorsed the relevant observations and recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ).

9. Since the Secretary-General's proposals were rather general in nature, the European Union wished to reserve its position until it received additional information. However, it saw merit in many of the proposals and stood ready to discuss them in more detail and take the necessary decisions once the follow-up reports had been submitted.

10. While the European Union did not support any proposal to vest decision-making in small, exclusive groups of States, recent events had clearly demonstrated that the current working methods of the Fifth Committee must be improved. Consequently, it was willing to consider more detailed proposals on governance with a view to moving forward in a way that respected the rights of all Member States.

11. The draft resolution currently before the Committee had not been prepared in accordance with the Committee's traditional working methods. It did not enjoy consensus and failed to reflect crucial concerns of the European Union and other delegations. Accordingly, the European Union could not agree to its adoption.

12. All the proposals in the Secretary-General's report were interrelated, and therefore the European Union could not subscribe to a selective approach. The General Assembly must be allowed to take a well-informed decision in May, on the basis of all relevant information, and the Secretary-General's advice on how to strengthen the management of the Organization, as contained in the report, should be given serious consideration.

13. The European Union had made every effort to reach a consensus on the issue in question and had continued to negotiate on all proposals on the table, including an alternative text it had drafted in a spirit of

compromise, until the very last minute. While he appreciated the efforts of the Group of 77 and China, he nevertheless wished to express his deep concern about the submission of a proposal that did not enjoy consensus and reflected, in many areas, the position of only one group of Member States.

14. The European Union did not wish to take action on the draft resolution because it undermined the long-standing working methods of the Fifth Committee and violated the consensus principle. Taking action on the proposal might further polarize the Members of the United Nations on the important issue of management reform, and he therefore appealed to all Member States to take those considerations into account when deciding how to vote on the draft.

15. **Mr. Bolton** (United States of America) said that, while his delegation did not support the draft resolution, it respected the tenacity with which the Group of 77 and China had argued its position and appreciated the good faith in which the negotiations had been conducted in an effort to reach a consensus.

16. On 27 April 2006, a letter had been addressed to the President of the General Assembly by the Permanent Representatives of more than 40 countries stating that the draft resolution before the Committee was not acceptable to them and that, while they were ready to work for a true consensus on a mutually agreeable text, forcing a decision on a draft resolution on which there was no consensus would leave them no alternative but to vote against it. The Permanent Representatives had also expressed concern that a vote in such circumstances could entail considerable disadvantages for the United Nations, for the proposal itself and for the budget process.

17. His own delegation considered that, without top-to-bottom management reform, the United Nations would be ill-equipped to meet the demands placed on it by Member States. It was committed to pursuing necessary management reforms to ensure that the Organization remained effective, efficient, transparent and accountable. It would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

18. **Mr. Oshima** (Japan) said that his delegation supported the Secretary-General's commitment to reforming the United Nations to make it more effective, efficient and accountable and better able to respond to current and future needs. It had therefore participated actively and constructively in the

discussions on the Secretary-General's report (A/60/692 and Corr.1) and in the efforts to reach a consensus thereon and would continue to do so in the future. It believed that many of the proposals contained in the report did not require legislative action and urged their implementation.

19. His delegation was disappointed at the predicament in which the Committee now found itself. Clearly, there was no consensus on draft resolution A/C.5/60/L.37/Rev.1. Rather than take a vote on the text, thereby breaching the Committee's long-standing practice of consensus decision-making, it would have been preferable to report faithfully and accurately to the General Assembly on the areas of agreement and disagreement; the Assembly could then have considered a way forward on the basis of the Secretary-General's report. His delegation had proposed a number of amendments to the draft resolution, which had not been taken fully into account. The adoption of the text as it stood would be interpreted as a rejection or deferral of necessary reforms. For all those reasons, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution, and it urged those delegations that shared its concerns to do likewise or else to abstain.

20. **Ms. Banks** (New Zealand), speaking also on behalf of Australia and Canada, said that the draft resolution before the Committee was not a product of consensus, nor did it reflect the three delegations' strong support for reform. Nevertheless, they were disappointed to have to vote against the text when a vote need not have taken place. For almost two decades, the work of the United Nations on administrative and budgetary matters had largely been based on the idea of consensus. That system had served the membership and the Organization well because it recognized that the vital interests of all groups must be accommodated.

21. Accordingly, while the three delegations had strongly disagreed with the assertion by the Group of 77 and China that the Secretary-General's proposals on governance should be rejected, they had been willing to consider temporarily setting aside proposals 20 and 21 in the interests of reaching a consensus on a draft resolution. In that connection, they commended the efforts of the European Union to formulate a proposal that incorporated the main thrust of the revision to section VIII proposed by South Africa on behalf of the Group of 77 and China and regretted that it had not been possible to achieve a compromise.

22. The draft resolution submitted represented an unnecessary departure from the system of mutual accommodation, there being no proposals on the table that required an immediate decision. Such a departure risked causing serious harm not only to the Committee, but also to members' shared interest in management reform. Rather than offer the Secretary-General strategic guidance, the Committee's role should instead have been to provide such comments as it could agree on as input for the General Assembly's consideration of the Secretary-General's report.

23. The 2005 World Summit Outcome (A/RES/60/1), a document adopted by consensus, had requested the Secretary-General to submit proposals on the conditions and measures necessary for him to carry out his managerial responsibilities effectively. Proposal 16 in document A/60/692 and Corr.1 responded to that request, and the delegations for which she spoke fully expected the Secretary-General to elaborate on it. Yet the draft resolution before the Committee sought to prevent him from doing so. The sponsors contended that the scope of proposal 16 went beyond the limited discretion granted to the Secretary-General in resolution 60/246. However, one group of Member States could not designate itself the sole arbiter of what constituted "limited discretion". The Summit Outcome had given the Secretary-General a standing mandate to propose the conditions and measures he needed to manage, and she urged him to fulfil that mandate.

24. The three delegations could not support the draft resolution before the Committee. They called on all delegations to consider the message that its adoption would send.

25. **Mr. Thomson** (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would be compelled to vote against draft resolution A/C.5/60/L.37/Rev.1. Nevertheless, it strongly supported the Secretary-General's vision of a reformed United Nations better able to respond to global developments and emergencies and urged him to carry forward those aspects of the reform proposals that were within his authority. In conveying his vision to the General Assembly, the Secretary-General had responded boldly to the request made of him in the 2005 World Summit Outcome, which had been adopted by Member States' leaders by consensus. Viewed against that background, the recent developments in the Committee were a setback for reform efforts, imposed by one group of Member States. While his delegation respected the concerns expressed by the

Group of 77 and China, it regretted the polarization of the discussions in the Committee, and it was dismayed that members were being forced to take action on a draft resolution on which there was no consensus. It had been the Committee's consistent practice to take decisions by consensus, even on the most difficult and sensitive issues. Departing from that practice would bode ill for the future integrity of the budget process. All delegations must now redouble their efforts to find consensus solutions to make the United Nations more effective, efficient and responsive. It was to be hoped that, once the Committee had had its say on the technical aspects of the Secretary-General's report, Member States could engage in a more constructive debate on the political aspects in the plenary Assembly.

26. **Mr. Trautwein** (Germany) said that the adoption of the draft resolution would make it difficult for the Secretary-General to further develop the proposals he had put forward, notwithstanding the mandate given him by the world's Heads of State and Government and the urgent need for reform. The submission of a draft resolution that was not a product of consensus, while not contrary to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, broke with a 19-year-old practice of the Committee and could have a very negative impact on its future work. Germany remained committed to reforming the United Nations in order to make it more effective, efficient and legitimate. Nevertheless, it would vote against the draft resolution.

27. **Mr. Sermoneta** (Israel) said that his delegation would like to be added to the list of delegations that had requested the recorded vote.

28. **Mr. Verbeke** (Belgium) acknowledged the efforts made by the Group of 77 and China to find a mutually acceptable solution to the current difficulties but expressed his regret that the Committee was being forced to vote on the draft resolution. The vote represented a departure from the long-standing practice of consensus in the Fifth Committee and the draft resolution itself ran counter to the Secretary-General's vision, a vision that was shared by his delegation. Management reform would enhance the effectiveness of the Organization and enable it to face the challenges before it in a more efficient manner. Belgium was not ready to rule out any options at the present stage, and it would therefore vote against the adoption of the draft resolution.

29. **Mr. Burian** (Slovakia) recalled that the Secretary-General's report outlined a general direction for the future of the Organization. While Slovakia reserved the right to comment in detail on individual proposals once additional information had been provided, it fully embraced the Secretary-General's vision and did not, at the present stage, want to rule out any options. He was very disappointed that, despite the best efforts of all concerned, it had been impossible to reach consensus on the draft resolution. The current text ran counter to the commitments made at the 2005 World Summit and, if adopted, would dramatically reduce the chance of achieving meaningful reform. One group of Member States had submitted a one-sided proposal, thereby undermining the long-standing practice of consensus and unnecessarily polarizing the entire membership of the Organization. It would therefore be unwise to adopt the draft resolution and his delegation would be voting against it.

30. **Mr. Majoer** (Netherlands) expressed serious concern about the short- and long-term consequences of the current situation for the future work of the Fifth Committee. He regretted the fact that, despite efforts to abide by its long-standing practice of consensus, the Committee was about to vote on a substantive matter.

31. The Netherlands was firmly committed to the United Nations and had honoured its commitment in both word and deed. However, the functioning of the Organization could and should be substantially improved and modernized, in order to free up resources for the benefit of the most disadvantaged and to attract additional funding. For that reason, his delegation welcomed the vision outlined in the Secretary-General's report and took the view that the Secretary-General had a right and indeed an obligation to present his views to the General Assembly.

32. His delegation had endorsed the Advisory Committee's observation that the report was too general and that more details should be provided before any decision was taken. However, the draft resolution currently before the Committee precluded the possibility of discussing the need to give the Secretary-General more flexibility in the area of management and the importance of avoiding micro-management by Member States. It was not in the interests of the membership as a whole to maintain the status quo. Consequently, while it remained fully committed to seeking agreement on reform-related issues in the future, under the present circumstances

the Netherlands would have to vote against the adoption of the draft resolution.

33. **Mr. Kovalenko** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation had made every effort to pursue the negotiating process. It believed that Member States could still have arrived at a mutually acceptable outcome and regretted that they had not done so. The Russian Federation would vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Committee, which reflected Member States' readiness to continue to consider management reform issues within the limits set by them and on the basis of the additional reports they had requested the Secretary-General to prepare. His delegation considered, and would continue to consider, all management reform proposals submitted by the Secretary-General based exclusively on the nature and extent of their contribution to increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the Secretariat's work, as envisaged in the 2005 World Summit Outcome. It trusted that the Secretary-General would proceed immediately to the preparation of further detailed proposals taking account of the guidance provided in the draft resolution. In that connection, it believed that Member States retained the right to raise any issue related to the functioning and reform of the Organization.

34. **Mr. De La Sablière** (France) expressed surprise that the Committee had decided to vote on the draft resolution, because a compromise had seemed within reach and the vast majority of Member States did not want to vote. The Committee must learn from the current regrettable situation, which would have far-reaching consequences for the Organization as a whole, and take steps to improve its negotiating procedures. France would be voting against the draft resolution for the reasons given by the representative of Austria.

35. **Mr. Choi Young-jin** (Republic of Korea) said that his delegation supported the Secretary-General's proposals on management reform. The Republic of Korea also supported the long-standing tradition of consensus in the Fifth Committee. For those reasons, it would vote against the adoption of the draft resolution.

36. **Mr. Papadopoulos** (Greece) said that every member of the Committee agreed that management reform was essential if the United Nations was to respond effectively and efficiently to the challenges of the twenty-first century. His delegation had hoped to

see a mutually acceptable draft resolution on management reform which addressed the concerns of all Member States, but unfortunately, despite the best efforts of the majority of those concerned, that was not the case. Accordingly, Greece was not in a position to support the text. He expressed regret that the Committee had had to depart from its traditional working methods and hoped that the plenary Assembly would manage to reach consensus.

37. **Mr. Yáñez-Barnuevo** (Spain) expressed regret that a vote would be taken on the draft resolution, which had not been prepared in accordance with the traditional working methods of the Fifth Committee and did not take account of the views of a significant number of Member States. Consequently, he would be voting against its adoption.

38. Despite the best efforts of the European Union, it had been impossible to reach consensus on the text of the draft resolution. He reiterated his delegation's support for the Secretary-General's efforts to reform the management of the United Nations with a view to achieving the common goal of effective and universally acceptable multilateralism.

39. **Ms. Lintonen** (Finland) said that she attached great importance to the Secretary-General's proposals and deeply regretted that the Committee had not been able to adhere to its long-standing practice of consensus. As a member of the European Union, Finland had been ready from the outset to make every possible effort to come up with a mutually acceptable solution but, in the absence of such a solution, it would be voting against the adoption of the draft resolution. She hoped that the vote would not have unforeseen and unfortunate consequences for the future work of the Fifth Committee and of the Organization as a whole.

40. **Mr. Berruga** (Mexico) reaffirmed his delegation's commitment to management reform, which was an essential part of the reform package that had been discussed at the 2005 World Summit. It was unfortunate that the Committee had been forced to vote on the draft resolution and abandon its long-standing tradition of consensus and particularly regrettable that it had been unable to engage in a detailed discussion of a question which was central to the debate as a whole. During the current session, efficiency and equity had emerged as seemingly contradictory values, but he firmly believed that it was possible to make the United Nations a more efficient and a fairer Organization. The

draft resolution currently before the Committee was the best way of taking the process forward and, accordingly, Mexico would vote in favour of its adoption.

41. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/60/L.37/Rev.1, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the

former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Armenia, Norway, Uganda.

42. *Draft resolution A/C.5/60/L.37/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 108 votes to 50, with 3 abstentions.*

43. **Mr. Løvald** (Norway) expressed his regret that the Committee had failed to reach consensus on the draft resolution and had been forced to vote on the text. Norway had abstained from the voting because it took the view that the draft resolution had to be assessed on the basis of its content. It would have preferred the Committee to react more positively to the proposals on management reform, particularly in the areas of human resource management, strengthening the authority of the Secretary-General and budget and finance. However, the draft resolution would enable the Organization to take the reform process forward and ensure that Member States received additional information on a number of the proposals contained in the report.

44. Core political issues had been raised during the discussion of the proposals on governance. From the outset, he had taken the view that the defining characteristic of the United Nations was its multilateral and universal nature and he therefore shared the concerns expressed by the Group of 77 and China about the potential of the governance proposals to change that nature. Consequently, he strongly cautioned against the establishment of new governance structures consisting of small, representative groups of Member States.

45. He reaffirmed Norway's strong commitment to the ongoing management reform efforts, which were designed to further strengthen the Organization. If those essential reforms were to be successful, all Member States must recognize that, as an intergovernmental organization, the United Nations could function only on the basis of compromise.

46. **Mr. Kumalo** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, reminded the Fifth Committee that the Group of 77 and China believed in the reform of the Organization and that it had tried, to the best of its ability, to reach a mutually acceptable solution.

47. All Member States, regardless of the size of their assessed contributions, had an equal right to participate in decision-making within the United Nations, and the Group of 77 and China was very attached to protecting the essential character of the Organization and, in particular, the oversight functions of the General Assembly. The successful implementation of the reform agenda required the collective engagement of all Member States, and the Group of 77 and China remained ready to support the Secretary-General in his efforts.

48. **r. Sardenberg** (Brazil) said that, as a member of the Group of 77 and China, his delegation was determined to further strengthen the role, capacity, effectiveness and efficiency of the United Nations. It remained committed to a management reform that would significantly improve the performance of the Organization in such key areas as development, peace, security and human rights and believed that such a reform was in the interest of all Member States.

49. Strengthened accountability was vital to ensure the effective and efficient implementation of legislative mandates, and the accountability of the Secretariat to all Member States was a fundamental part of management reform. The Secretary-General should set out clear parameters and propose instruments to ensure that accountability rules were rigorously enforced without exception at all levels.

50. The proposals on governance posed considerable difficulties for his delegation. It would be unacceptable to divide up the workload of the Fifth Committee among select working groups of limited membership, because such an arrangement would undermine the universal nature of the General Assembly, deprive certain Member States of the possibility of contributing to the review of the budget and give credence to the misconception that the Organization's management problems were due to its universal character.

51. He was convinced that the vote on the draft resolution had been a last resort in the face of obdurate opposition.

52. **Mr. Butagira** (Uganda) said that his delegation had abstained from voting because, in its view, the vote was premature. It would have been possible to reach a consensus, particularly in view of the efforts by the Secretary-General to move the process in that direction. The fact that the Committee had been forced to vote at such an early stage would undermine

subsequent negotiations. Furthermore, since the Committee was viewed as the technical branch of the plenary Assembly, a vote which might prevent the plenary from taking a decision on such an important matter would have negative consequences.

53. **Mr. Abdel Aziz** (Egypt) said that the Committee needed to redouble its efforts to reach consensus on all reform proposals contained in reports by the Secretary-General. It was important to strive for a stronger Organization that would continue to preserve its intergovernmental nature and would continue to be based on equality and North-South cooperation. It should be remembered that all Member States were equal partners, regardless of their level of development and contribution to the budget.

Agenda item 124: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (continued)

Estimates in respect of special political missions, good offices and other political initiatives authorized by the General Assembly and/or the Security Council (continued) (A/60/7/Add.24 and Add.37 and A/60/585 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and 2)

54. **Ms. Udo** (Nigeria) said that her Government would continue to work with all other delegations to introduce reforms to further strengthen the Organization. It appreciated the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General in that regard.

55. Her Government was particularly grateful for the Secretary-General's contribution to the politically sensitive work of the Nigeria-Cameroon Mixed Commission. The work of the Commission reflected awareness of the challenges entailed, but also the opportunities to reinforce peace, trust and confidence on both sides. She noted with satisfaction the level of cooperation with Cameroon within the Commission. Much had been achieved and, with the continued cooperation and support of all parties, under the able leadership of the Secretary-General, it was certain to make further progress.

Agenda item 122: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (continued)

Draft decision A/C.5/60/L.39

56. **The Chairman** drew attention to draft decision A/C.5/60/L.39, entitled "Questions deferred for future consideration".

57. *Draft decision A/C.5/60/L.39 was adopted.*

58. **Mr. Ozawa** (Japan), speaking in explanation of position, said it was regrettable that the Member States had failed to adopt a draft resolution on the scale of assessments, thereby neglecting to provide guidance to the Committee on Contributions. The draft resolution was of a procedural nature, and in the past, such draft resolutions had been adopted by consensus. General Assembly resolutions 51/212 B and 54/237 D had been discussed and adopted by Member States, despite the fact that a consensus had not been reached with regard to the methodology to be used for the next scale period. The Fifth Committee had decided to send all proposals to the Committee on Contributions, with the understanding that Member States would be engaging in full-fledged negotiations in the autumn.

59. It was unreasonable that the unwillingness of a few Member States to acknowledge such precedents had prevented the Committee from adopting a resolution which would have served the wider interests of the entire membership of the Organization. By neglecting well-founded practices and depriving the Committee on Contributions of the guidance it deserved, those Member States had seriously undermined the established method of deciding the next scale of assessments.

60. Japan was of the view that the Fifth Committee should continue to make efforts to save the negotiation process from an unprecedented situation. Based on the proposal that it had submitted to the Committee, Japan intended to continue to take part in the negotiations to agree on a more equitable scale of assessments.

61. **Mr. Kovalenko** (Russian Federation) said that the draft resolution fully reflected the outcome of the negotiations. His delegation had worked resolutely to reach a compromise and lamented that the negotiations had been suspended, at the request of a certain delegation. It was taken aback by the accusations of the representative of Japan, and pointed out that such an approach made it difficult to establish a businesslike atmosphere in the Committee. It therefore urged all delegations to respect the positions taken by others.

62. **Mr. Wang Xinxia** (China) said that his delegation supported the decision to defer further consideration of the scale of assessments to the sixty-first session of the General Assembly. Together with other delegations, his delegation had made every effort to reach consensus on the report of the Committee on Contributions and deeply regretted the failure to do so. As to the statement by the representative of Japan on the question of established practices, if a Member State believed that a certain practice was inappropriate, that practice could be changed.

63. **Mr. Pfanzelter** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that his delegation was disappointed at the Committee's failure to adopt a resolution on the scale of assessments. The resolution was simply a procedural matter and there was a clear precedent for the adoption of such resolutions.

64. **Mr. Wallace** (United States of America) said that his delegation regretted the failure to reach a consensus on a draft resolution to provide further direction to the Committee on Contributions for its June session. It had made clear its position on purchasing power parity during the March session.

Completion of the work of the Fifth Committee at the first part of the resumed sixtieth session of the General Assembly

65. **Ms. Lock** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Committee had managed to adopt numerous resolutions on many important issues. It had adopted resolutions to provide adequate financing to the nearly 30 special political missions for 2006 and had ensured that a Peacebuilding Support Office would be operationalized for the current biennium. It had provided guidance to the Secretariat with regard to performance evaluation and monitoring. It had considered improvements to the accountability framework of the Secretariat and had adopted a resolution that included the agreements reached by the Committee in December 2005 on the Ethics Office and the external evaluation and governance review. It also had adopted the resolution that would provide financing to the capital master plan project and had acted on the report of the Committee on Conferences.

66. **The Chairman** declared that the Fifth Committee had completed its work at the first part of the resumed sixtieth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 8.05 p.m.